arXiv:1410.3589v1 [math.LO] 14 Oct 2014

DEFINABLE TYPES IN ALGEBRAICALLY CLOSED VALUED FIELDS

PABLO CUBIDES KOVACSICS AND FRANÇOISE DELON

Abstract. Marker and Steinhorn shown in [13] that given two models $M \prec N$ of an o-minimal theory, if all 1-types over M realized in N are definable, then all types over M realized in N are definable. In this article we characterize pairs of algebraically closed valued fields satisfying the same property. Although it is true that if M is an algebraically closed valued field such that all 1-types over M are definable then all types over M definable, we build a counterexample for the relative statement, *i.e.*, we show for any $n \geq 1$ that there is a pair $M \prec N$ of algebraically closed valued fields such that all n-types over M realized in N are definable but there is an $n+1$-type over M realized in N which is not definable. Finally, we discuss what happens in the more general context of C-minimality.

1. Introduction

Let L be a first order language, Σ an L-theory and M a model of Σ. For a subset $A \subseteq M$ and a type $p(x) \in S(A)$, recall that $p(x)$ is *definable* if for every L-formula $\phi(x,y)$ there is an $L(A)$-formula $\delta_\phi(y)$ such that for all $a \in A^{|y|}$, we have that $\phi(x,a) \in p$ if and only if $M \models \delta_\phi(a)$ (x and y denote finite tuples). Stable theories are precisely those theories for which over *every* model all types are definable. However, it is possible to find models of an unstable theory over which all types are also definable. For instance, by a result of van den Dries in [7], all types over the real field are definable. The same is true for the p-adics by a result of Delon in [6]. Marker and Steinhorn generalized van den Dries result in [13] showing that any o-minimal structure over which all 1-types are definable has all types definable. In fact, they proved a stronger result, namely, that given two models $M \prec N$ of an o-minimal theory, if all 1-types over M realized in N are definable, then all types over M realized in N are definable. Let us introduce some notation:

Definition 1.1. Let Σ be an L-theory, $M \prec N$ two models of Σ. For $n \geq 1$, we note $T_n(M,N)$ if for every $a \in N^n$, $tp(a/M)$ is definable. We use $T_n(M)$ to denote $T_n(M,N)$ with N an $|M|^+$-saturated elementary extension of M or, equivalently, to say that M satisfies $T_n(M,N)$ for every elementary extensions N.

What was previously stated can be summarized as:

Theorem 1.2. *Let Σ be an L-theory. Then*

Date: 22/04/2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 12J10, 03C60, 13L05; Secondary 03C98.

The first author was supported by the Marie Curie Initial Training Network in Mathematical Logic - MALOA - From MAthematical LOgic to Applications, PITN-GA-2009-238381.

(1) Σ *is stable if and only if* $\bigwedge_{n\geq 1} T_n(M,N)$ *for all models* $M \prec N$ *of* Σ.

(2) If Σ *is o-minimal and* $M \prec N$ *are two models of* Σ *then* $T_1(M,N)$ *implies* $\bigwedge_{n\geq 1} T_n(M,N)$.

Part (1) goes back to Shelah (a proof of this can be found in [14]). Part (2) corresponds to the Marker-Steinhorn theorem proved in [13] and reproved in [15] by Pillay. Notice that if for all models $M \prec N$ of a theory Σ it is true that $T_1(M,N)$ implies $T_n(M,N)$ for all $n \geq 1$, then it is true in particular that $T_1(M)$ implies $T_n(M)$ for all $n \geq 1$. As a consequence, part (2) implies that a model of an o-minimal theory over which all 1-types are definable is a model over which all types are definable. Counterexamples to possible generalizations of (2) are the following:

Theorem 1.3 (Baizhanov)**.** *There is a weakly o-minimal theory* Σ *and models* $M \prec N$ *of* Σ *such that* $T_1(M,N)$ *but not* $T_2(M,N)$.

Theorem 1.4 (Chernikov-Simon)**.** *There is a NIP theory* Σ *and a model* M *of* Σ *such that* $T_1(M)$ *but not* $T_2(M)$.

Their proofs can be found in [1] and [3] respectively. It is then natural to ask if it is still possible to find analogues of Marker-Steinhorn's theorem in other subclasses of NIP, for instance in C-minimal structures.

Definition 1.5. Let $C(x,y,z)$ be a ternary relation. A *C-set* is a structure (M,C) satisfying axioms (C1)-(C4):

(C1) $\forall xyz(C(x,y,z) \to C(x,z,y))$,
(C2) $\forall xyz(C(x,y,z) \to \neg C(y,x,z))$,
(C3) $\forall xyzw(C(x,y,z) \to (C(w,y,z) \vee C(x,w,z)))$,
(C4) $\forall xy(x \neq y \to C(x,y,y))$,
(D) $\forall xy(x \neq y \to \exists z(z \neq y \wedge C(x,y,z)))$.

If in addition (M,C) satisfies axiom (D) we say it is a *dense* C-set. A *C-structure* is any expansion of a C-set.

Definition 1.6. A C-structure M is *C-minimal* if for every elementary equivalent structure $N \equiv M$, every definable subset $D \subseteq N$ is definable by a quantifier free formula using only the C-predicate. A complete theory is *C-minimal* if it has a C-minimal model.

O-minimal and C-minimal structures have both differences and similarities. If a linearly ordered structure M is such that any definable subset $D \subseteq M$ is a finite union of intervals and points then this is also true for any structure N elementary equivalent to M. In contrast, there are C-minimal structures $M \equiv N$ such that in M every definable subset $D \subseteq M$ is a Boolean combination of quantifier free $\{C\}$-formulas but this is not true in N. In addition, C-minimal theories do not need to satisfy the exchange property nor need to have prime models over sets, two properties satisfied by o-minimal theories (see [12]). Nevertheless, there is a cell decomposition theorem for dense C-minimal structures together with a well-behaved notion of topological dimension, both introduced by Haskell and Macpherson in [9] (see also [4]). As previously stated, it is thus natural to ask the following questions:

Question 1.7. *[Solved] Let Σ be a C-minimal theory and $M \prec N$ models of Σ. Is it true that $T_1(M,N)$ implies $T_n(M,N)$ for all $n \geq 1$?*

Question 1.8. *[Open] Let Σ be a C-minimal theory and M a model of Σ. Is it true that $T_1(M)$ implies $T_n(M)$ for all $n \geq 1$?*

In what follows we will give a negative answer to question 1.7 by studying pairs $M \prec N$ of algebraically closed non-trivially valued fields (whose common theory is denoted by ACVF). By quantifier elimination, one can show that algebraically closed valued fields are C-minimal with respect to the C-relation defined by $C(x,y,z) \Leftrightarrow v(x-y) < v(y-z)$. In this context where the C-relation is given by an ultrametric, C-minimality is equivalent to the fact that any definable subset of the structure is a Boolean combination of open or closed balls. We prove the following theorem (all terms to be defined):

Theorem 1.9. *Let $(K \prec L, v)$ be to models of $ACVF$. The following are equivalent*

(1) $T_n(K,L)$ holds for all $n \geq 1$.
(2) $(K \subseteq L, v)$ is a separated extension and $T_1(vK, vL)$ holds.

Using this theorem we show :

Proposition 1.10. *For any $n \geq 1$ there is an extension $K \prec L$ of models of $ACVF$ such that $T_n(K,L)$ holds but $T_{n+1}(K,L)$ does not.*

Note that the construction of this example is suggested in [2]. It is also closely related to the "necessity of geometric sorts" for elimination of imaginaries in algebraically closed valued fields (see [8] 3.5). Also, recall that question 1.8 restricted to models of $ACVF$ has a positive answer (see [6] or theorem 3.3 in the present article). The article will be divided as follows: section 1 is devoted to the proof of theorem 1.9; in section 2, the counterexample to question 1.7 is presented.

2. Definable types in $ACVF$

The background used on valued fields can be found essentially in [16]. For valued fields $(K \subseteq L, v)$ we will denote either by $K/v, L/v$ or k, l their respective residue fields and by vK, vL their valuation groups. All completions of ACVF are determined by the characteristic of the field and the characteristic of the residue field. They are denoted by $ACVF_{x,y}$, where x is the characteristic of the field and y is the characteristic of the residue field. We recall some terminology and notation:

Definition 2.1. Let $(K \subseteq L, v)$ be an extension of valued fields

(1) A point $a \in L$ is *limit* over K if for any ball B of K containing a there is a ball B' in K containing a such that $B' \subsetneq B$.
(2) K is *maximal* if any family of nested non-empty balls has non-empty intersection.
(3) K is *definably maximal* if every definable family of nested non-empty balls has non-empty intersection.
(4) For $x \in L$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in L$,

$$I_n(x, y_1, \ldots, y_n; K) := \left\{ v\left(x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i y_i \right) : e_1, \ldots, e_n \in K \right\}.$$

Remark 2.2. K is maximal if and only if no extension $L \supseteq K$ contains a limit point over K. Clearly maximal implies definably maximal and this later property is first order definable. Every completion of $ACVF$ has a model which is a maximal valued field (for instance the Hahn field $k((G))$ with G a divisible ordered abelian group and k a model of ACF_0 is such a model of $ACVF_{0,0}$). Thus all models of $ACVF$ are definably maximal.

Definition 2.3. Let Σ be an L-theory, $M \prec N$ two models of Σ and $n < \omega$. Subsets of M^n of the form $\phi(M) = \{a \in M^n : N \models \phi(a)\}$ for some $L(N)$-formula $\phi(x)$ are called *externally definable*. For $n \geq 1$, we let $W_n(M, N)$ state that for every $L(N)$-formula $\phi(x)$ with $|x| = n$, the set $\phi(M)$ is M-definable. In other terms, every externally definable set with parameters in N and n variables is M-definable. As with $T_n(M)$, we use $W_n(M)$ to denote $W_n(M, N)$ with N an $|M|^+$-saturated elementary extension of M or, equivalently, to say that M satisfies $W_n(M, N)$ for every elementary extensions N.

It is a routine exercise to show that

$$\bigwedge_{n\geq 1} T_n(M, N) \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{n\geq 1} W_n(M, N).$$

Proposition 2.4. *Let $(K \prec L, v)$ be models of $ACVF$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $W_1(K, L)$;
(2) for any ball B in L, $B \cap K$ is K-definable;
(3) $T_1(vK, vL)$.

Proof. Recall that a 1-type over a model of an o-minimal theory is not definable if and only if the type defines a cut[1]. We show $1 \Rightarrow 3$ by contraposition, so let $\gamma \in vL$ realize a cut over vK. Then it is easy to see that the set $\{x \in K : v(x) > \gamma\}$ is not a Boolean combination of K-definable balls, *i.e.*., it is not definable in K. For $3 \Rightarrow 2$, given a ball B in L, either its radius (*i.e.* valuational radius) γ is $\gamma \in vK$, or γ realizes a type of the form $\beta^{\pm}$ with $\beta \in vK$, or $\gamma < vK$, or $vK < \gamma$. We can assume that the ball B is centered at $a \in K$, for if not, then $B \cap K = \emptyset$ which is K-definable. Notice this deals with the case $vK < \gamma$. If $\gamma \in vK$, there is nothing to show. Suppose that $\gamma < vK$, then $B \cap K = K$, which is again K-definable. Suppose that γ realizes a type of the form β^+ with $\beta \in vK$. Then the K-definable open ball B' of radius β centered at a satisfies that $B' = B \cap K$. Suppose that γ realizes a type of the form β^- with $\beta \in vK$. Then the K-definable closed ball B' of radius β centered at a satisfies that $B' = B \cap K$. Finally, $(2 \Rightarrow 1)$ holds by C-minimality. □

Let (K, v) be a model of $ACVF$. The space of 1-types over K has three kinds of non-realized types: residual types, valuational types and limit types. Let p be a non-realized 1-type over K and let a be a realization of p in some elementary extension (L, v) of (K, v). The type p is *residual* if $K/v \subsetneq K(a)/v$, or equivalently for some $k_1, k_2 \in K$, $v(k_1a + k_2) = 0$ and $(k_1a + k_2)/v \notin K/v$ (in this case we have that $vK(a) = vK$). The type p is valuational, if $vK \subsetneq vK(a)$, or equivalently if for some $k \in K$, $v(a - h) \notin vK$ (in this case $K(a)/v = K/v$). Finally, p is a

[1]By definition, an element $\gamma \in vL$ realizes a cut over vK if there are subsets $U, V \subsetneq vK$ such that $U \cap V = \emptyset$, $U \cup V = vK$ and $\forall x \in U \forall y \in V(x < \gamma < y)$.

limit type if $K(a)$ is an immediate extension of K, or equivalently if a is limit over K. Notice that a residual type is always definable and valuational types are not definable exactly when they determine a cut in vK.

Corollary 2.5. *Let $(K \prec L, v)$ be models of ACVF. Then $T_1(M,N)$ implies $W_1(M,N)$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $T_1(K,L)$ implies $T_1(vK, vL)$. Thus $W_1(K,L)$ follows by 2.4. □

Proposition 2.6. *Let p be a limit type over K. Then p is not definable.*

Proof. Suppose that $a \in L$ is a limit point over K. Consider $D := \{(y,z) \in K^2 : v(a-y) \geq v(z)\}$. If $tp(a/K)$ was definable, the family $D_z := \{y \in K : (y,z) \in D\}$ indexed by all $z \in K$ such that D_z is not empty, would be a definable family of nested balls with empty intersection, contradicting that all algebraically closed valued fields are definably maximal. □

Corollary 2.7. *$T_1(K,L)$ if and only if $T_1(vK, vL)$ and L does not contain any limit point over K.*

Proof. Suppose $T_1(K,L)$. We clearly have $T_1(vK, vL)$ and by Proposition (2.6) L does not contains a limit point over K. For the right-to-left implication, given that L does not contain limit points, all 1-types realized in L are either residual or valuational. Moreover, since $T_1(vK, vL)$ holds, all valuational types realized in L are definable. Therefore, $T_1(K,L)$ holds. □

Corollary 2.8. *$W_1(K,L)$ does not imply $T_1(K,L)$ or $W_2(K,L)$.*

Proof. Take K not maximal and L a proper immediate extension. Therefore, since $vK = vL$ we have that $T_1(vK, vL)$ and by 2.4, $W_1(K,L)$. However, for any $a \in L \setminus K$, a is limit over K and hence both $tp(a/K)$ and the set $D := \{(y,z) \in K^2 : v(a-y) \geq v(z)\}$ are not definable. □

We present some known results on divisible ordered abelian groups that will be later used (see chapter 2 of [11]). Let *DOAG* be the theory of non-trivial divisible ordered abelian groups. This theory is complete and model-complete. If G and H are ordered groups, we use $G \trianglelefteq H$ to express that G is a *convex subgroup* of H.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $G \prec H$ be models of DOAG. The following are equivalent:*

1. *$T_1(G,H)$;*
2. *$T_n(G,H)$ for all $n \geq 1$;*
3. *there are convex subgroups $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2 \trianglelefteq H$ such that $C_2 = G \times C_1$ with the lexicographic order;*
4. *for all $x \in H$, if there is $y \in G$ such that $|x| < |y|$ then there is some $z \in G$ such that $|x - z| < G^{>0}$.*

Proof. Given that DOAG is o-minimal, the equivalence between (1) and (2) follows by the Marker-Steinhorn theorem. For (1) implies (3), let C_2 be the convex hull of G in H and C_1 the biggest convex subgroup of H such that all positive elements are below $G^{>0}$ (where $G^{>0} := \{x \in G : x > 0\}$). By construction, G embeds in C_2/C_1 and C_2/C_1 does not realize over G any type of the form $\pm\infty$ nor $0^{\pm}$, therefore no type of the form $a^{\pm}$ for $a \in G$. Therefore, if $C_2/C_1 \neq G$, C_2/C_1 must realize a cut over G which implies that C_2 and hence H realizes a cut over G. Thus $G = C_2/C_1$,

hence $C_2 = G \times C_1$ as groups. Now $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ implies that $C_2 = G \times C_1$ as ordered groups. To show (3) implies (4), let $x \in H$ be such that $|x| < |y|$ for some $y \in G$. Then $x \in C_2$, so $c = g + e$ with $g \in G$ and $e \in C_1$. Finally, to show (4) implies (1), suppose that $a \in H$ lies in a cut over G. Then there is $y \in G$ such that $|a| < |y|$, but there is no $g \in G$ such that $|a - g| < G^{>0}$. □

Definition 2.10. Let $(K \subseteq L, v)$ be an extension of valued fields.

(1) A sequence $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in L$ is *separated* if for all $k_1, \ldots, k_n \in K$ it satisfies

$$v\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i y_i\right) = \min\{v(k_i y_i); 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

(2) The extension $(K \subseteq L, v)$ is *separated* when every finitely generated K-vector subspace of L has a separated basis, *i.e.*., for all $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in L$ there are $y_1, \ldots, y_m \in L$ such that $\sum x_i K = \sum y_i K$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_m$ is a separated sequence.

This definition was introduced by Baur in [2]. The following results about separated extensions will be later used (their proofs can be found in [2] and [5] respectively):

Theorem 2.11 (Baur)**.** *If a valued field K is maximal, then any valued field extension of K is separated.*

Theorem 2.12 (Delon)**.** *Let $(K \subseteq L, v)$ be an extension of algebraically closed valued fields.*[2] *Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) the extension $(K \subseteq L, v)$ is separated;
(2) L is linearly disjoint over K with any immediate extension of K (in any common valued extension);
(3) for all n and all $x, y_1, \ldots, y_n \in L$, $I_n(x, y_1, \ldots, y_n; K)$ has a maximal element.

For a field F we use F^a to denote its field-theoretic algebraic closure. A simple but important corollary of the previous theorem is

Corollary 2.13. *Let $(K \subseteq L, v)$ be models of ACVF and m a trivially valued algebraically closed subfield of L. Then the extension $(K \subseteq K(m)^a, v)$ is separated.*

Lemma 2.14. *Let $(K \subseteq L, v)$ be an extension of valued fields. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) the extension is separated;
(2) for some (any) valuation $w \leq v$, both extensions $(K \subseteq L, w)$ and $(K/w \subseteq L/w, v/w)$ are separated.

Proof. We show $1 \Rightarrow 2$, so let w be a valuation such that $w \leq v$. The extension $(K \subseteq L, w)$ is w-separated: given that $w \leq v$, a v-separated sequence must be w-separated. So it remains to show that $(K/w \subseteq L/w, v/w)$ is separated. Take $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in (L/w)^n$. We show there is a v/w-separated basis for the K/w-vector subspace generated by a. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are linearly independent over K/w. Therefore, any $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in L^n$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, b_i satisfies both that $w(b_i) = 0$ and $a_i = b_i/w$, is a w-separated

[2]Here (K, v) algebraically maximal and Kaplansky conditions are enough.

sequence (and also linearly independent over K). Let b' be a v-separated basis for the K-vector subspace generated by b. Thus for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, $b'_j = \sum k_{ji} b_i$ where $k_{ji} \in K$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since b is w-separated, $w(b'_j) = w(k_{ji} b_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, so modulo some multiplication by an element in K, we can assume that $w(b'_j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ (note that this new sequence is also a v-separated basis for the K-vector space generated by b). It is easy to see that b'/w is v/w-separated and clearly a basis for a. For the converse, *i.e.*, $2 \Rightarrow 1$, let $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in L^n$ and let $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_r)$ be a w-separated basis of the K-vector subspace generated by a. Let $\{v(b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq r\} = \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_s\}$ where $\gamma_1 < \cdots < \gamma_s$. For $1 \leq j \leq s$, let m_j, $1 \leq m_j \leq r$, be such that $v(b_{m_j}) = \gamma_j$ and suppose, by renaming the sequence b, that for all $1 \leq j \leq s$, all b_m such that $m_j \leq m < m_{j+1}$ have the same value γ_j. Then for each $1 \leq j \leq s$ define the sequence

$$\beta_j := (b_i b_{m_j}^{-1}/w : m_j \leq i < m_{j+1}).$$

For each $1 \leq j \leq s$, there is a v/w-separated basis α_j for the K/w-vector subspace generated by β_j. For $a'_j \in \sum b_i b_{m_j}^{-1} K$ an arbitrary lifting of α_j, $(b_{m_j} a_j)_{1 \leq j \leq s}$ constitutes a v-separated basis for the K-vector subspace generated by a. □

We are now ready to prove theorem 1.9:

of theorem 1.9: The proof idea of $2 \Rightarrow 1$ goes back to Delon in [6]; we include it here for completion. By 1.2, $T_n(vK, vL)$ holds for all $n \geq 1$. In order to show $T_n(K, L)$ for all $n \geq 1$, we show instead that $W_n(K, L)$ holds for all $n \geq 1$. By elimination of quantifiers in $ACVF$ in the language of rings together with a predicate for the divisibility relation ($x|y$ if and only if $v(x) \leq v(y)$), it is enough to consider definable subsets of L defined by formulas of the form

$$v(P(x)) \geq v(Q(x)), \tag{2.1}$$

where $P, Q \in L[X]$ for $X := (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$. The K-vector subspace of L generated by the coefficients in P and Q has a separated basis $\{l_1, \ldots, l_m\}$, which means that we can rewrite P and Q as

$$P(X) = \Sigma l_i p_i, \text{ with } p_i \in K[X] \qquad Q(X) = \Sigma l_i q_i, \text{ with } q_i \in K[X]$$

where for $x \in K$ we have

$$v(P(x)) = \min\{v(l_i p_i(x)); i\} \qquad v(Q(x)) = \min\{v(l_i q_i(x)); i\}.$$

Therefore (2.1) is equivalent to

$$\bigvee_{i_P, l_Q} \left(\bigwedge_i \left(v(l_{i_P} p_{i_P}(x)) \leq v(l_i p_i(x)) \wedge v(l_{i_Q} q_{i_Q}(x)) \leq v(l_i q_i(x)) \right) \wedge v(l_{i_Q} q_{i_Q}(x)) \leq v(l_{i_P} p_{i_P}(x)) \right).$$

Each inequality of the form

$$v(l' q(x)) \leq v(lp(x)),$$

where $l, l' \in L$ and $p, q \in K[X]$ is equivalent to

$$v(l') + v(q(x)) \leq v(l) + v(p(x)). \tag{2.2}$$

By $W_n(vK, vL)$, there is a formula $\phi(u, v)$ with parameters in K such that formula $\phi(v(p(x)), v(q(x)))$ is equivalent to (2.2). Therefore, the set of points in K satisfying the formula (2.1) is K-definable.

To show $1 \Rightarrow 2$, suppose for a contradiction that $(K \subseteq L, v)$ is an extension such that $T_n(vK, vL)$ holds for all n but the extension is not separated. Also, by Corollary 2.7 no point in L is limit over K.

Claim 2.15. *We can assume that $vK = vL$.*

By Proposition 2.9, there are convex subgroups $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2 \trianglelefteq vL$ such that $C_2 = vK \times C_1$. Consider on L the valuation $v_1 := v/C_1$. It satisfies that $v_1 \restriction K = v \restriction K$. This implies that $(v/v_1)(K/v_1) = 0$ so the extension $(K/v_1 \subseteq L/v_1, v/v_1)$ is separated (note that if $v \restriction K = 0$ then (K, v) is maximal, which by Theorem 2.11 implies that every extension if separated). By lemma 2.14, the extension $(K \subseteq L, v_1)$ is not separated. Furthermore v_1K is convex in v_1L. Thus we can define $v_2 = v_1/v_1K$. We have that $v_2 \restriction K = 0$, therefore $(K \subseteq L, v_2)$ is separated. Applying lemma 2.14 again, $(K/v_2 \subseteq L/v_2, v_1/v_2)$ is not separated. But $(v_1/v_2)(K/v_2) = (v_1/v_2)(L/v_2) = vK$, therefore L/v_2 is for the valuation v_1/v_2 a non-separated extension of K/v_2 with the same value group. Furthermore, L/v_2 contains no limit point over K/v_2 with respect to v_1/v_2 as any $l \in L$ such that l/v_2 is limit over K/v_2 with respect to v_1/v_2 will be *a fortiori* limit over K with respect to v. This completes the claim.

We assume now $vL = vK$. By Theorem 2.12, let n be a positive integer minimal such that there are $x \in L$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in L^n$ such that $I_n(x, y; K)$ has no maximal element. Notice that we can assume $n \geq 1$ given that L does not contain any limit point over K. Moreover, since $vK = vL$, we can also assume that $v(x) = v(y_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ (notice that for all $e, e_1, \dots, e_n \in K$, $I_n(ex, (e_1y_1, \dots, e_ny_n); K) = I_n(x, y; K) + v(e)$).

Claim 2.16. *We can assume that $y_1/v, \dots, y_n/v$ are linearly independent over K/v.*

For $m \leq n$ and $z_1, \dots, z_m \in L$ we let $\gamma_{m-1}(z_m, (z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}))$ be the maximal element in $I_{m-1}(z_m, (z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}); K)$ which exists by the minimality of n. We show by induction on m, with $1 \leq m \leq n$, that every K-vector subspace of L generated by less than m elements (that we suppose linearly independent over K) has a basis $(y_1, \dots, y_m)$ such that $y_1/v, \dots, y_m/v$ are linearly independent over K/v. By induction, we can assume that $y_1/v, \dots, v_{m-1}/v$ are linearly independent over K/v (note that $m = 1$ is possible here). Since $vK = vL$ we have that $\gamma_{m-1}(y_m, (y_1, \dots, y_{m-1})) = v(e)$ for some $e \in K$. For $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, let $e_i \in K$ be such that $v(y_m + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} e_iy_i) = v(e)$ and $y'_m := (y_m + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} e_iy_i)e^{-1}$. If there were $a_1, \dots, a_m \in K$ such that $v(a_my'_m + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_iy_i) > 0$ and $v(a_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, then

$$\begin{aligned} v(a_my'_m + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_iy_i) > 0 \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad v(y'_m + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_ia_m^{-1}y_i) > 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad v(((y_m + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} e_iy_i)e^{-1}) + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_ia_m^{-1}y_i) > 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad v(y_m + (\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} e_iy_i + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_ia_m^{-1}ey_i)) > v(e), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the maximality of $v(e)$ in $I_{m-1}(y_m, (y_1, \dots, y_{m-1}); K)$. Therefore elements $y_1/v, \dots, y_{m-1}/v, y'_m/v$ are linearly independent over K/v, which completes the proof of the claim.

Let $(\gamma_\alpha)_{\alpha<\alpha_0} \subseteq I_n(x,y;K)$ be a strictly increasing cofinal sequence in $I_n(x,y;K)$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ let $(k_{i,\alpha})_{\alpha<\alpha_0}$ be sequences such that for each $\alpha < \alpha_0$, $k_{i,\alpha} \in K$ and $\gamma_\alpha = v(x + \sum y_i k_{i,\alpha})$.

Claim 2.17. *We can assume that for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, the sequence $(k_{i,\alpha})_{\alpha<\alpha_0}$ is a PC sequence (pseudo-Cauchy sequence) with $v(k_{i,\alpha} - k_{i,\beta}) = \gamma_\alpha$ whenever $\alpha < \beta < \alpha_0$.*

By Claim 2.16 we can assume that $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ is a separated basis with $v(y_i) = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore, for $\alpha < \beta < \alpha_0$, given that $v(\sum y_i(k_{i,\alpha} - k_{i,\beta})) = \gamma_\alpha$, by separation there is $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $\gamma_\alpha = v(y_i) + v(k_{i,\alpha} - k_{i,\beta}) = v(k_{i,\alpha} - k_{i,\beta})$. As a consequence, there must be $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that, for α in a cofinal subset of α_0 and any $\beta > \alpha$, we have $\gamma_\alpha = v(k_{j,\alpha} - k_{j,\beta})$. So $(k_{j_\alpha})_{\alpha<\alpha_0}$ is a PC sequence. Furthermore, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have that $v((k_{i,\alpha} - k_{i,\beta})y_i) \geq \gamma_\alpha$ by definition of separated basis. By the minimality of n we have in fact equality for α cofinal in α_0. For suppose there is $1 \leq l \leq n$ and some $\alpha_1 < \alpha_0$ such that for all $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha < \beta < \alpha_0$, $v((k_{l,\alpha} - k_{l,\beta})y_l) > \gamma_\alpha$. Then for $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha < \alpha_0$ we will also have

$$v(x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{i,\alpha} y_i) = \gamma_\alpha = v(x + k_{l,\alpha_1} y_l + \sum_{i \neq l} k_{i,\alpha} y_i),$$

so taking $x' = x + k_{l,\alpha_1} y_l$ will get that $\gamma_\alpha \in I_{n-1}(x', (y_i)_{i\neq l}; K)$ for all $\alpha_1 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, which contradicts the minimality of n since clearly $I_{n-1}(x', (y_i)_{i\neq l}; K) \subseteq I_n(x,y;K)$. Therefore each sequence $(k_{i,\alpha})_{\alpha<\alpha_0}$ is PC.

Claim 2.18. *For all $1 \leq i \leq n$, the sequence $(k_{i,\alpha})_{\alpha<\alpha_0}$ does not have a pseudo-limit in K.*

Suppose for a contradiction there is $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $(k_{i,\alpha})_{\alpha<\alpha_0}$ has a pseudo-limit $k \in K$. Let $y' = (y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, \ldots, y_n)$. Given that for each $\alpha < \alpha_0$, $v(k_{i,\alpha} - k) = \gamma_\alpha$, it is not difficult to show that $I_{n-1}(x - ky_i, y'; K) = I_n(x,y;K)$, which contradicts the minimality of n.

Let K^* be a $|K|^+$-saturated extension of K and for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ let $k_i^* \in K^*$ be a pseudo-limit for $(k_{i,\alpha})_{\alpha<\alpha_0}$. By construction, we have that for all $e_1, \ldots, e_n \in K^n$ and $\alpha < \alpha_0$

$$v\left(x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i y_i\right) > \gamma_\alpha \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} v(e_i - k_i^*) > \gamma_\alpha.$$

We show that the set $D := \{(\gamma, k_1, \ldots, k_n) \in vK \times K^n : v(x + \sum k_i y_i) \geq \gamma\}$ is not definable in K, which implies that $T_{n+1}(K,L)$ does not hold. Indeed, if it was, the projections on $vK \times K$ (where K is say the first copy in K^n) will also be definable. Given that $ACVF$ is definably maximal, a pseudo-limit of $(k_{1,\alpha})_{\alpha<\alpha_0}$ would belong to K contradicting Claim 2.18. □

3. Counterexample

As stated in the introduction, this section is devoted to Proposition 1.10.

Proof of Proposition 1.10: The idea is to build an extension $K \prec L$ of algebraically closed valued fields with the following properties:

- $td(L;K) = n+1$
- The extension $(K \subseteq L, v)$ is not separated
- For any M such that $K \subseteq M \subseteq L$ and $td(M;K) \leq n$, the extension $(K \subseteq M, v)$ is separated.

Let k be an algebraically closed field and $K = k(X,Y)^a$ with $0 = v(k) < v(X) << v(Y)$. Consider elements in a big valued field extension of K with the following properties:

(1) $\bar{t} := (t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ such that $v(k(t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = 0$ and $t_1/v, \ldots, t_n/v$ are algebraically independent over k;
(2) $\bar{f} := (f_1, \ldots, f_{n+1})$, with $f_1, \ldots, f_{n+1} \in k((X))$ algebraically independent over $k(X)$, and $v(f_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n+1$;
(3) $t_{n+1} := \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i t_i + f_{n+1}$.

Note that $f_1, \ldots, f_{n+1}$ are still algebraically independent over $k(\bar{t}, X)$. Indeed, $k((X))$ and $k(\bar{t}, X)$ are linearly disjoint over $k(X)$ by Proposition 2.12 $(1 \Rightarrow 2)$. Finally, let $L := K(t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1})^a$. By construction, $k(\bar{t}, X, Y)^a \subseteq L \subseteq k(\bar{t})((X))(Y)^a$, hence $vK = vL$ and $L/v = k(t_1/v, \ldots, t_n/v)^a$. The result is a consequence of the following two claims:

Claim 3.1. *$\mathbb{Z}v(X)$ is cofinal in $I_{n+1}(t_{n+1}, 1, t_1, \ldots, t_n; K)$.*

Claim 3.2. *For any field M such that $K \subseteq M \subset L$ and $td(M,K) \leq n$, M is a separated extension of K.*

Suppose for the sake of argumentation both claims are true. By theorem 1.9, Claim 3.2 shows $T_i(K,L)$ for all $i \leq n$. Claim 3.1 shows that $T_{n+1}(K,L)$ is not true since the definability of the type $tp(t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}/K)$ would imply the definability of $I_{n+1}(t_{n+1}, 1, t_1, \ldots, t_n; K)$, which defines a cut in vK. We proceed to prove the claims.

Proof of Claim 3.1: We have that

$$I_{n+1}(t_{n+1}, 1, t_1, \ldots, t_n; K) = \left\{ v\left(f_{n+1} + e_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i(f_i + e_i) \right) : e_1, \ldots, e_{n+1} \in K \right\}.$$

Now $v(t_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $f_i \in k((X))$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ and K contains $k(X)$. This shows $\mathbb{Z}v(X) \subseteq I_{n+1}(t_{n+1}, 1, t_1, \ldots, t_n; K)$. It remains then to show $I_{n+1}(t_{n+1}, 1, t_1, \ldots, t_n; K) \subseteq C$ where $C \trianglelefteq L$ is the biggest convex subgroup of $\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}$ not containing $v(Y)$. Suppose towards a contradiction that there are $e_1 \ldots, e_{n+1} \in K$ such that for $v(t_{n+1} + e_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i t_i) > C$. Thus, if we introduce the valuation $w := v/C$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i t_i + f_{n+1} + e_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i t_i \right) / w = 0$$

which contradicts that $f_1, \ldots, f_{n+1}$ are algebraically independent over $k(\bar{t}, X)$ given that $K/w = k(X)^a \subseteq k((X))^a$. This completes the Claim 3.1.

Proof of Claim 3.2: We have the following diagram:



By Corollary 2.13, the extension $K \subseteq K(\bar{t})^a$ is separated and by Theorem 2.12 $K(\bar{t})^a$ and $K(\bar{f})^a$ are linearly disjoint over K. Suppose now there exists some algebraically closed field M such that $K \subseteq M \subset L$ (hence $td(M,K) \leq n$) and the extension $(K \subseteq M, v)$ is not separated. Let m be a lifting of M/v in M and l a lifting of L/v in L such that $k \subseteq m \subseteq l$. Given that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} n & = & td(l;k) \\ & = & td(l;m) + td(m;k) \\ & \leq & td(L;M) + td(K(m)^a;K) \\ & = & td(L;K) - td(M;K(m)^a) \\ & \leq & n+1 - td(M;K(m)^a), \end{array}$$

we have that $td(M;K(m)^a) \leq 1$. If $td(M;K(m)^a) = 0$, then $M = K(m)^a$ and $(K \subseteq M, v)$ is separated by Corollary 2.13. Suppose towards a contradiction that $td(M;K(m)^a) = 1$. This implies that $L = M(l)^a$. Therefore we have the following diagram:



By Corollary 2.13, since $L = M(l)^a$, the extension $M \subseteq L$ is separated. Notice that by construction, $M \subseteq K(m,\bar{f})^a$ is an immediate extension. Therefore, by implication $(1 \Rightarrow 1)$ of Theorem 2.12, L and $K(m,\bar{f})^a$ are linearly disjoint over M. But this implies that the field of definition of the ideal

$$Ann(t_1,\ldots,t_n,t_{n+1};K(m,\bar{f})^a) := \{P \in K(m,\bar{f})^a[T_1,\ldots,T_n,X] : P(t_1,\ldots,t_{n+1}) = 0\}$$

is contained in M (see for instance chapter III, Theorem 8 in [10]). On the other hand, this ideal is generated by the polynomial

$$X - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i f_i + f_{n+1}\right)$$

which implies that $f_1,\ldots,f_{n+1}$ belong to the field of definition. Since they are algebraically independent over K, $td(K(\bar{f});K) = n+1$ contradicts that $td(M;K) \leq n$.

This construction provides valued fields of equal characteristic. To get the counterexample for models of $ACVF_{0,p}$ with p a prime number, take for k the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and replace v by its composition with the p-adic valuation. □

While the previous result shows that the Marker-Steinhorn theorem cannot be generalized to $ACVF$ and therefore cannot be generalized to C-minimality, the following remains true:

Theorem 3.3. *Let K be a model of $ACVF$. Then, $T_1(K)$ implies $T_n(K)$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. Let K be a model of $ACVF$ such that $T_1(K)$ holds. By 2.7, we have that $T_1(vK, vL)$ and for all extensions L of K, L does not contain limit points over K. Therefore, K is in particular maximal. By Baur's Theorem 2.11, this implies that all extensions are separated. The result follow by 1.9. □

Question 1.8 remains open. We do not know either of any counterexample to question 1.8 for weakly o-minimal theories.

References

1. B. S. Baizhanov, *Definability of 1-types in weakly o-minimal theories*, Siberian Advances in Mathematics **16** (2006), no. 2, 1–33.
2. W. Baur, *Die Theorie der Paare Reell Abgeschlossener Körper*, Logic and algorithmic: An International Symposium Held in Honour of Ernst Specker, Monographies de L'Enseignement Mathematique, vol. 30, Kindig, 1982, pp. 25–34.
3. Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon, *Externally definable sets and dependent pairs II*, Transactions of AMS (–), to appear.
4. Pablo Cubides-Kovacsics, *An introduction to C-minimal structures and their cell decomposition theorem*, Valuation Theory in Interaction (Antonio Campillo, Franz-Viktor Kuhlmann, and Bernard Teissier, eds.), Series of Congress Reports of the EMS, European Mathematical Society, 2014, pp. 167–207.
5. Françoise Delon, *Extensions séparées et immédiates de corps valués*, The Journal of Symbolic Logic **53** (1988), no. 2, pp. 421–428.
6. Françoise Delon, *Définissabilité avec paramètres extérieurs dans $\mathbb{Q}_p$ et $\mathbb{R}$*, Proc. Amer. Math. **Soc. 106** (1989), pp. 193–198.
7. Lou van den Dries, *Tarski's problem and pfaffian functions*, Logic Colloquium '84 (Amsterdam) (A. Wilkie J. Paris and G. Wilmers, eds.), North-Holland, 1986, pp. 59–90.
8. Deirdre Haskell, Ehud Hrushovski, and Dugald Macpherson, *Definable sets in algebraically closed valued fields: elimination of imaginaries*, Journal fuer die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik **597** (2006), pp. 175–236.
9. Deirdre Haskell and Dugald Macpherson, *Cell decompositions of C-minimal structures*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **66** (1994), no. 2, pp. 113–162.
10. S. Lang, *Introduction to algebraic geometry*, Interscience tracts in pure and applied mathematics, Interscience Publishers, 1958.
11. Adam H. Lewenberg, *On elementary pairs of o-minimal structures*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1995.
12. Dugald Macpherson and Charles Steinhorn, *On variants of o-minimality*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **79** (1996), no. 2, pp. 165–209. MR 1396850 (97e:03050)
13. David Marker and Charles I. Steinhorn, *Definable types in o-minimal theories*, The Journal of Symbolic Logic **59** (1994), pp. 185–198.
14. Anand Pillay, *An introduction to stability theory*, Oxford Logic Guides, no. 8, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1983.
15. Anand Pillay, *Definability of types, and pairs of o-minimal structures*, The Journal of Symbolic Logic **59** (1994), no. 4, pp. 1400–1409 (English).
16. P. Ribenboim, *Théorie des valuations*, Presses Univ. Montral, Montral, 1964.

Laboratoire Paul Painlevé, Université Lille 1, CNRS U.M.R. 8524, 59655 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex, France
E-mail address: Pablo.Cubides@math.univ-lille1.fr

Équipe de Logique Mathématique, Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu - Paris Rive Gauche, Université Paris Diderot, UFR de mathématiques, case 7012, 75205 Paris Cedex 13, France
E-mail address: delon@math.univ-paris-diderot.fr